

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is requested. The claims as amended herein incorporate the changes made in the Amendment After Final filed April 5, 2007, which should be entered prior to this Amendment.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner implies claim 12 may be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed processor is only "configured to," perform funcitons, but does not actually perform the claimed functions. Applicants believe the Examiner's rationale is misplaced. Applicants fail to appreciate how the "configured to," language in claim 12 renders the claim unstatutory. What the Examiner appears to be addressing is the scope of the claim resulting from the "configured to," language. Applicants submit, however, that such language is fully acceptable and in accordance with U.S. practice. If the Examiner believes such language still renders claim 12 unstatutory, Applicants request the Examiner provide sufficient reasoning as to why such language renders the claim unstatutory. Otherwise, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of above remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding rejection and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Andrew M. Waxman at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By   
Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

DJD/AMW

